



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Site of Lachish. In the *STUDENT* for November, some information was given in regard to the supposed identification of the biblical Lachish in the ruins of Tell Hesi where Mr. Petrie is excavating. In the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of Oct. 1890 appears a note from Prof. J. A. Paine in which he maintains that Tell Hesi is not Lachish for the following reasons among others: (1) It cannot satisfy the conditions which are demanded by the statements of Eusebius and Jerome concerning Lachish, e. g., Lachish was inhabited in the days of these fathers while Tell Hesi ceased to be inhabited seven centuries before; nor is it in the proper position relative to other sites as indicated by them. (2) Lachish, so far as we know, never suffered at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, but Tell Hesi did. (3) Lachish was besieged by Sennacherib but the pictures of the reign made by the Assyrians themselves do not tally with the conditions present at Tell Hesi. These and some other considerations are insurmountable. Tell Hesi cannot be Lachish. What can it be then? It is a very old site. Prof. Paine suggests Gath and gives a number of arguments in favor of this identification. Students will look with interest on the further discussion of this question which certainly seems to be open to debate in view of the considerations urged by Professor Paine.

The Spirits in Prison: 1 Peter 3: 18-20. Interest in this obscure text and the possible inferences from it seem to be perennial. Rev. Dr. Witherspoon offers in the *Homiletic Review* for Nov. 1890 a new interpretation. The original element in his exegesis he regards as the view taken of the phrases *in flesh* and *in spirit*. The one designates the fleshly organism in which alone Christ could be put to death. What then must the other phrase denote if not that organism which could receive quickening? But the only adequate and satisfactory object of this quickening could be the spiritual body, the human soul entering the transformed body and quickening it to life. Hence the activity which Christ undertook was undertaken after his resurrection when he entered the spiritual body. As to the question of this activity, the work that Jesus did in his "preaching" was proclamation of his victory over sin and death, a proclamation made to the universe and heard to its remotest bounds by those antediluvians who might be supposed on account of their great guilt to inhabit this outer circle of darkness. The purpose of the apostle in the whole passage, which was to encourage the persecuted saints, would be strongly effected by the teaching of these particular verses thus interpreted. The interpretation if correct removes this passage from the realm of teaching regarding probation and brings it into harmony with the context. It is interesting but still not convincing especially in its central idea, the explanation of "in spirit."

Luke 7: 37 and Mary Magdalene. In reply to a question as to the ground for identifying the woman that was a sinner with Mary of Magdala, Professor A. B. Bruce replies, in the *Expository Times* as follows: "Nothing is known. The Fathers of the Western Church who first, hesitatingly, favored the identification (Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine) knew nothing more than we know. The universal currency of the opinion that the two women were one and the same person, during the Middle Ages, was due to the authority of Gregory the Great. The adoption of the view by the translators of the Authorized Version, as shown in the heading of Luke vii., 'Mary Magdalene anointeth Christ's feet,' only exemplifies the tenacity with which opinion holds